

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The present Office action is made in response to the amendment filed on 1/26/2010 and the Interview of 2/24/2010.
2. It is noted that in the amendment, applicant has made changes to the specification and the claims. Regarding to the claims, applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 9-10, 12 and 16. There is not any claim being added into or canceled from the application. The pending claims are claimed 1-7 and 9-16. Note that claim 8 was canceled in the amendment of 8/21/2007.

It is also noted that in the amendment, applicant has requested to amend the specification. However, the applicant's requests to amend the specification as stated in the amendment of 1/26/2010 are not approved because the requested changes are for the Publication application, not the present U.S. application.

Claim Objections

3. The objections to claims 1-7 and 9-16 as set forth in the previous Office action have been overcome by the amendments to the claims as provided in the amendment of 1/26/2010.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments regarding to the rejections of claims 2-3 and 11-12 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as provided in the amendment of 1/26/2010 have been fully considered and yielded the following conclusions.

First, regarding to the rejections of claims 2 and 11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, applicant's arguments as provided in the amendment of 1/26/2010 and in the interview of 2/24/2010 are persuasive and thus the rejection to claims 2 and 11 are now withdrawn.

Second, regarding to the rejections of claims 3 and 12 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, applicant's arguments as provided in the amendment of 1/26/2010 and in the interview of 2/24/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. At the conclusion of the interview on 2/24/2010, applicant has agreed to cancel claims 3 and 12. See Interview Summary Record. The cancellation of claims 3 and 12 are made by an Examiner's amendment as provided below.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

5. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Irah H. Donner on 2/24/2010.

The application has been amended as follows:

A) In the specification.

First, *DO NOT ENTER THE CHANGES TO THE SPECIFICATION AS REQUESTED BY APPLICANT IN THE AMENDMENT OF 1/26/2010.*

Second, replace the paragraph appeared on page 4, lines 11-15 of the specification submitted on 4/10/2008 with the following amended paragraph.

--Preferably, however, it is sufficient for reduction of the glare problem if only the top one third of the mirror surface is treated with the anti-glare material. In this preferred embodiment, only the surface above the curved line identified by reference number 36 (in Fig. 2A) is covered with the anti-glare material. Note that the line 36 is curved relative to the straight surface bisecting line 22. In some embodiments, the portion treated to reduce glare encompasses less than one-third of the mirror surface. --

B) In the claims.

a) CANCELED CLAIMS 3 AND 12.

b) In claim 9: on line 6, changed "the school bus" to --said school bus--.

c) In claim 10: on line 12, changed "the bottom half" to --a bottom half--.

d) In claim 16: on line 12, changed "the bottom half" to --a bottom half--.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, and 13-16 are allowed.

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The cross-view mirror assembly installed on a vehicle wherein the mirror of the assembly has a contoured outer mirror surface of a convex, generally dome shaped mirror surface and having an upper portion is treated with an antiglare material to reduce glare as claimed is readable over the prior art provided by stout (U.S. Patent No. 4,822,157) and Falge (U.S. Patent No. 1,768,354);

however, the device as claimed in each of the independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 16 is allowed because applicant has submitted sufficient Declaration and written papers to show the commercial success, of the device claimed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thong Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2316. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephone B. Allen can be reached on (571) 272-2434. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thong Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2872